First named inventor: Karamatas   Page 11
Serial no. 10/644,133
Filed 8/20/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920030013US1

REMARKS

Claim rejection under 35 USC 101

Claims 16 and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory intangible embodiments. The Examiner has suggested language to be included in claims 16 and 21 to render them being directed to just statutory tangible embodiments. Applicant has amended claims 16 and 21 per the suggested language, and submits that claims 16 and 21 satisfy 35 USC 101.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-10, 12-19, and 21-30 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. These claims are limited to one or more nodes being processorless and memoryless, and the Examiner notes that the specification teaches one or more nodes either being processorless or memoryless. Applicant has amended these claims so that they simply recite one or more nodes being memoryless, and therefore submits that these claims satisfy 35 USC 112.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner has suggested removing the phrase "each of" in this claim to render it definite. Applicant has amended claim 7 per the suggested language, and submits that claim 7 satisfies 35 USC 112.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-10, 12-19, and 21-30 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiick in view of Carpenter. Prior to amendment, the claims were limited to one or more nodes being processorless or memoryless, as interpreted by the Examiner. The Examiner found all the limitations of the claims in Kiick, except for one or more nodes being processorless

First named inventor: Karamatas   Page 12
Serial no. 10/644,133
Filed 8/20/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920030013US1

(in particular), and instead found this limitation in Carpenter, such that Carpenter in view of Kiick renders the claimed invention obvious.

Applicant has amended the claimed invention, however, so that one or more nodes are particularly memoryless, as opposed to being processorless. As such, Kiick in view of Carpenter does not render the claimed invention unpatentable, because these references in combination do not teach one or more nodes being memoryless – they only teach one or more nodes being processorless. For at least this reason, the claimed invention is patentable.

Applicant is potentially amenable to adding other limitations to the claims to render them patentable. The Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Applicant's representative, Mike Dryja, at the phone number below, with suggested claim language if such language would render the claims patentable over at least Kiick in view of Carpenter to the satisfaction of the Examiner.

First named inventor: Karamatas   Page 13
Serial no. 10/644,133
Filed 8/20/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920030013US1

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicant's representative, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

April 11, 2007
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
704 228th Ave NE #694
Sammamish, WA 98074
tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 206-374-2819